REMARKS

In response to the Office Action dated January 4, 2008, claims 1, 9, 16 and 22 have been amended. Claims 1-28 are in the case. Reexamination and reconsideration of the application, as amended, are requested.

The Office Action rejected claims 1-15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Carmi et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0174242) in view of Nakamura et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,009,643) in view of Ohkubo (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0184653) and in view of Horvitz et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,505,167). The Office Action rejected claims 16-28 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Carmi et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0174242) in view of Nakamura et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,009,643) and in view of Ohkubo (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0184653).

The Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections based on the amendments to the claims and the arguments below.

The Applicant's newly amended independent claims 1, 9 and 22 now include the features of a wireless network configured to automatically create at least one folder of the event on a third party's peripheral device in response to the automatic determination that the e-mail message contains a date of the event. Also, claim 16 now includes wirelessly connecting a third party's peripheral device directly to the peripheral device and automatically creating at least one folder of the event on a third party's peripheral device in response to the peripheral device and the automatic determination that the e-mail message contains a date of the event. Support for these amendments can be found throughout the specification and at least in FIGS. 2-4 and paragraph [0025] of the Application specification (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2005/0083406).

In contrast, the combined references merely disclose automatic determination of image storage location using image metadata comparison method (see Fig. 1, the Abstract and the Summary of Nakamura et al.), creating folders by the computing device and then storing and organizing images in the created folders (see paragraphs [0151] – [0164] of Carmi et al.) classifying image data sets into an event (see Abstract and Summary or Ohkubo) and automatically scheduling an event based on an email

9

message and scheduling probability (se Abstract and Summary of Horvitz et al.).

Although the Examiner stated that "it would have been obvious to...use the email parsing system of Horvitz along with the calendaring system of Nakamura to automatically schedule events in the calendar in response to received email messages...", in light of the newly added features, the Applicant respectfully traverse this statement. Namely, with regard to claims 1, 9 and 22, the Applicant submits that even though the combined references disclose scheduling an event based on an email message (see Abstract and Figures 2 and 3 of Horvitz et al.), the combined references clearly still do **not** disclose the Applicant's claimed wireless network configured to automatically create at least one folder of the event on a **third party's peripheral device** in response to the automatic determination that the e-mail message contains a date of the event. Also, with regard to claim 16, the combined cited references are clearly missing the Applicant's claimed wirelessly connecting a third party's peripheral device directly to the peripheral device and **automatically creating at least one folder of the event on a third party's peripheral device** in response to the peripheral device and the automatic determination that the e-mail message contains a date of the event.

As such, since the combined cited references do **not** disclose, teach or suggest the Applicant's claimed using a wireless network to automatically create at least one folder of the event on a third party's peripheral device (claims 1, 9 and 22) or wirelessly connecting a third party's peripheral device directly to the peripheral device and automatically creating at least one folder of the event on a third party's peripheral device (claim 16), the combined references **cannot** render the Applicant's invention obvious. This failure of the cited reference to disclose, suggest or provide motivation for the Applicant's claimed invention indicates a lack of a prima facie case of obviousness and, thus, the rejections should be withdrawn (MPEP 2143).

Further, with regard to the dependent claims, since they depend from the above-argued respective independent claims, they are therefore patentable on the same basis. (MPEP § 2143.03). Also, the other references cited by the Examiner also have been considered by the Applicant in requesting allowance of the dependant claims and none have been found to teach or suggest the Applicant's claimed invention.

10

Thus, it is respectfully requested that all of the claims be allowed based on the amendments and arguments. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejection of the claims and to pass this application to issue. Additionally, in an effort to further the prosecution of the subject application, the Applicant kindly **requests** the Examiner to telephone the Applicant's attorney at **(818) 885-1575**. Please note that all mail correspondence should continue to be directed to

Hewlett Packard Company
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

Respectfully submitted,
Dated: May 5, 2008

Edmond A. DeFrank
Reg. No. 37,814
Attorney for Applicant
(818) 885-1575 TEL
(818) 885-5750 FAX

11